DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 297 HE 016 351

AUTHOR Hill, Malcolm D.
TITLE Some Factors Affecting the Job Satisfaction of Academic Women.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Educational Sociology; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Males; *Sex Differences; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Women Faculty

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction of 752 male and 195 female faculty in 16 Pennsylvania colleges and unviersities was studied. Job satisfaction was measured by a 45-item inventory, and factor analysis of the inventory revealed the following components of job satisfaction: (1) teaching, (2) recognition-support, (3) convenience, (4) economic, (5) administrative, and (6) associational. Further analysis indicated that the first three facets represented an intrinsic dimension and the last three represented an extrinsic dimension. A stepwise regression analysis was run for each sex on the two dimensions of job satisfaction to assess the predictive strength of various background items and to determine whether the two sexes differ with respect to the kinds of influences that affect their job satisfaction. Little difference in job satisfaction was found between the sexes, although there were indications that differences in sex may affect the kinds of expectations that a person has about work in academia. Dissatisfaction with work was greater among younger faculty, those in the lower academic ranks, and those who teach in the humanities and social and behavioral sciences. An outline including subcategories of the six job satisfaction factors is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231297

HE

Some Factors Affecting the Job Satisfaction of Academic Women

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Malcolm D. Hill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Prepared for Presentation

at the

Annual Meeting

of the

American Educational Research Association

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Montreal, Canada

April 11-15

1983

by

Malcolm D. Hill

Assistant Professor of Sociology

Altoona Campus

The Pennsylvania State University

Altoona, Pa. 16602

HE 016 351

Printed in the U.S.A.

Abstract

This study examines the subject of job satisfaction of academic women in sixteen Pennsylvania institutions of higher education. Comparison of data for 741 men and 195 women indicate that women do not differ significantly from men in overall satisfaction with work or in facet-specific dimensions of job satisfaction. Correlational and regression analyses suggest that sex is not an important factor affecting the job satisfaction of academic women; Rather it is a variety of sex-related items associated with work and with the career patterns of these women that seems to determine their satisfaction with work.

Although numerous writers have directed attention to the topic of job satisfaction among college and university faculty, very few have attempted to compare the attitudes of men and women faculty toward the subject.[1] In view of the widespread concern with women's issues in higher education (cf. Moore, 1980) the apparent lack of interest in the job satisfaction of academic women is difficult to understand. Perhaps academics dislike considering the possibility that they might harbor the same foibles and prejudices of ordinary mortals. Possibly they are simply averse to subjecting themselves to the same kind of scrutiny they direct toward others. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that this issue has been woefully neglected and calls for much more attention than it has received.

Clues as to whether sex is a crucial factor leading to differences in the job satisfaction of academics have to be gleened from studies conducted outside academia. Here the volume of research is almost overwhelming (cf. Kanter, 1977; Sauser and York, 1978; Weaver, 1978). However, the results strike the observer as being something less than conclusive. For example, Herzberg, Mausner, Petersen and Capwell (1957) after reviewing 21 studies concluded that "the studies comparing men and women in job satisfaction do not lead to any simple conclusion about such differences" (p. 13). More recent research on the subject indicates similar findings and appears to suggest that sex per se is not a crucial factor affecting job satisfaction (Quinn, Staines and McCullough, 1974; Sauser and York, 1978; Weaver, 1978). More speci-

fically, this research suggests that the determinants of job satisfaction are essentially the same for both sexes, even though their effects may vary somewhat in intensity. Hulin and Smith (1964) maintain that it is "the entire constellation of variables which consistently covary with sex" that affects sex differences in job satisfaction, and that if the effects of such things as pay, job level, promotional opportunities, and societal norms were held constant or partialled out, sex differences in job satisfaction would disappear.

If the assertions mentioned above apply to faculty in higher education we might expect to find that (a) there are no differences between the sexes on job satisfaction, or (b) there are differences in job satisfaction between male and female faculty which disappear when the covariates of sex are controlled or partialed out, and (c) the determinants of job satisfaction are essentially the same for both sexes. Using these notions as a point of departure the present study represents an attempt to compare the job satisfaction of male and female faculty and to determine whether the features that are associated with job satisfaction are the same for both sexes.

Although numerous variables have been found to be associated with the job satisfaction of workers in business and industry,[2] not all of them are appropriate to the work situation in higher education. In this study a handful of items that seemed appropriate to higher education were selected for analysis. These were categorized as follows:

1. Institutional characteristics -- (1) type of institution, (2) sexual composition of faculty.

2. Faculty activities and affiliation -- (1) disciplinary affiliation, (2) time devoted to routine academic tasks, (3) scholarly activities, (4) faculty development activities.

3. Faculty characteristics -- (1) previous work experience, (2) age, (3) degree level, (4) academic rank.

Methodology

In order to assess the issues described above questionnaires were sent to all full-time faculty at fifteen institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania. These institutions included five community colleges, four private liberal arts colleges, four state colleges, and two universities. Of those faculty contacted, 742 men and 195 women completed and returned the survey questionnaire for a response rate of 45.5 per cent.

Job satisfaction was measured by a 45-item Likert-type inventory that reflected various dimensions of the work environment of higher education. A principal components factor analysis of this inventory revealed the presence of six facet-specific areas of job satisfaction. These areas include (1) Teaching, (2) Recognition-Support, (3) Convenience, (4) Economic, (5) Administrative, and (6) Associational facets of job satisfaction. Factor correlations of these six facets indicate that they separate into two distinct dimensions, one representing an intrinsic dimension and the other an extrinsic dimension of job satisfaction. The intrinsic dimension includes the first three of these facets and the extrinsic dimension is comprised of the remaining three facets. Subscales representing each of these dimensions were developed from items comprising the six principal factors; Subscale scores for each respondent were derived from the factor loadings of

the respective items. Reliability of the subscales was assessed by Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Coefficients were found to vary from .84 to .92. These subscales and the items comprising them are presented in Appendix A.

T-tests were used to compare differences in group means for male and female faculty on the facet-specific areas of job satisfaction and on the intrinsic-extrinsic dimensions. Product Moment Correlations were generated to assess the association between independent variables and intrinsic-extrinsic satisfaction for each sex. Subsequently, a step-wise regression analysis was run for each sex on each of the two dimensions of job satisfaction to assess the predictive strength of various background items and to determine whether the two sexes differ with respect to the kinds of influences that affect their job satisfaction.

Data Analysis

Male-Female Differences in Job Satisfaction

T-tests of male-female means of the six facet-specific areas of job satisfaction indicates that although the scores for men are slightly higher than those of women in all areas, the differences between the sexes is not significant. The data on intrinsic-extrinsic dimensions show similar patterns with men having slightly higher levels of satisfaction than women on both dimensions. Again, the differences were not significant. These results indicate that the male-female faculty surveyed here do not differ in any appreciable way in either intrinsic or extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction - a finding which suggests that sex is not an important variable affecting the job satisfaction of

Table 1

Means of Facet-Specific Areas and Intrinsic-Extrinsic Dimensions of Job Satisfaction for Male and Female College Professors

Dimensions and Facets of Job Satisfaction	Men (N=742)		Women (N=194)	
1. The Intrinsic Dimension				
a. Teaching	4.86		4.85	
b. Convenience	4.59		4.54	
c. Recognition-Support	3.98		3.93	
Overall Intrinsic Dimension		4.48		4.44
2. The Extrinsic Dimension				
a. Economic	4.38		4.25	
b. Administration	4.03		3.99	
c. Associations	4.27		4.21	
Overall Extrinsic Dimension		4.23		4.15

college faculty.

The Influence of Background Variables on Job Satisfaction

The data reflecting the influence of independent variables on job satisfaction of male-female faculty reveal that the determinants of job satisfaction show few consistent patterns for the two sexes. The effects tend to vary depending on which item one considers and which dimension of satisfaction one examines. As a result we find that in some instances women faculty are very similar to men and in others quite different, with respect to items that affect their attitudes. In reviewing the influence of these items we shall follow the categories outlined earlier.

A. Institutional Characteristics

Judging from these statistics, there is little doubt that the place of employment excercises a significant influence on the extrinsic satisfaction of both male and female professors but little if any on the intrinsic dimension. Employment in private liberal arts colleges appears to have a negative influence on extrinsic satisfaction while employment in state colleges is associated with heightened extrinsic satisfaction. Such differences between types of institutions undoubtedly reflect variations in the conditions of work, particularly economic conditions. The data also show that women who teach in universities differ from their male counterparts in expressing significantly higher rates of extrinsic satisfaction with work.

In institutions where women constitute more than twenty percent of the faculty body extrinsic satisfaction is significantly enhanced for both sexes. The effects of this item seem to be very pronounced for

women. The finding suggests that in institutions with more equitable hiring practices the extrinsic conditions of work are more favorable than those in other institutions.

B. Faculty Activities and Affiliations

The findings on faculty affiliations indicate support for those researchers who report that disciplinary affiliation is associated with job satisfaction (cf. Ladd and Lipset, 1975). Specifically, these findings show that irrespective of sex faculty in the humanities and fine arts tend to be less satisfied on both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions than are other faculty. In other disciplines where significant associations with job satisfaction are found, the two sexes tend to differ. For example, women in the social and behavioral sciences report significantly less satisfaction with extrinsic features than their male counterparts. In the field of education men were found to be the least satisfied on both dimensions. However, teaching in mathematics and the physical sciences seems to enhance the extrinsic satisfaction of men. For women, teaching in the nursing and health sciences has a significant and positive effect on both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction. In fact, the evidence here reveals that women in these academic areas are among the most highly satisfied of all disciplinary groups - a finding which probably reflects the dominant position of women in these fields.

An examination of the material dealing with the amount of time faculty devote to routine academic activities shows that men and women who devote large amounts of time to research activities are significantly less satisfied with extrinsic features of their work than colleagues with

less energetic research interests. Previous research has reported similar findings in this regard (cf. Berman, 1979). It may also be noted that the more time men and women spend on institutional paperwork the less satisfied they are with intrinsic aspects of their work. On the other hand, serving on committees and working with student groups has a tendency to promote extrinsic satisfaction among men, but not among women. Also, in the extrinsic domain, the data indicate that heavy involvement in committee work affects men and women differently inasmuch as it enhances this mode of satisfaction for men and reduces it for women.

Although very few trends emerge from the data on scholarly activities, two tendencies can be noted: men who submit papers for publication report higher levels of extrinsic satisfaction than men who do not; Among women no similar patterns were found. There is also a tendency shared by both sexes to report greater extrinsic satisfaction as the number of memberships in professional organizations increases; and while the same factor seems to promote the intrinsic satisfaction of men, it fails to do so for women.

In the literature on higher education considerable attention has been given to the need for faculty development programs. The intent of such programs is to promote more effective teaching. Whether they accomplish this objective is something we cannot answer here. But what we do find among those surveyed in this study is that involvement in these kinds of programs tends to have a negative effect on intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Specifically, women who have taken in-service teaching programs are significantly less satisfied on the intrinsic dimension than women who have not taken similar programs. For both men and women, having

attended workshops on teaching and having been involved in teaching seminars pertaining specifically to one's discipline induces negative consequences for intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction.

Background Characteristics of Faculty Members

Since many faculty members at various institutions have come to academia from different occupational backgrounds we were interested in determining whether this kind of socialization experience has any effect on an individual's job satisfaction. The findings suggest that previous career experiences have only limited effects. These effects are apparent only for women faculty and are confined to the intrinsic dimension of job satisfaction. Specifically, the statistics indicate that women who have served in the armed forces and those who have come to higher education from careers in industry have significantly lower levels of intrinsic satisfaction than other women.

In assessing respondents' academic background the intention was to determine whether the degree level of the individual, recency of terminal degree (Ph.D.), and the prestige of the degree granting institution influence job satisfaction. For women, none of these items has any effect. Among men who had earned their doctorates very recently (within the past five years) there was a significant tendency to be less satisfied with both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of work. Perhaps this discrepency between men and women can be explained by a gap between occupational expectations and the objective conditions of work in most institutions, a gap that may be more pronounced for men than for women.

Table 2

Correlational Coefficients for Various Independent Variables and Intrinsic-Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Male and Female College Professors

Independent Variable	Dimensions of Job Satisfaction			
	Intrinsic		Extrinsic	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
I Institutional Characteristics				
A. Type of Institution				
(1) Community College	.02	.10	-.03	.08
(2) Private Liberal Arts College	.03	-.12	-.13*	-.22*
(3) State College	-.03	.00	.18*	.24*
(4) University	.05	.01	-.05	.16**
B. Sexual Composition of Institution[a]	-.02	.10	.15*	.30*
II Faculty Activities and Affiliations				
A. Academic Affiliation				
(1) Humanities & Fine Arts	-.15*	-.13**	-.12*	-.18*
(2) Social & Behavioral Sciences	-.03	-.04	-.02	-.13**
(3) Education	-.11*	.00	-.08**	.02
(4) Math & Physical Sciences	.03	.02	.08**	.05
(5) Natural Sciences	.05	.01	.03	.09
(6) Engineering or Engineering Technology	.00	.01	.05	.10
(7) Social Service	.00	-.05	.01	.03
(8) Nursing & Health Sciences	.02	.19*	.02	.20*
(9) Other Vocational	.03	.02	.03	.04
B. Time Devoted To Routine Academic Tasks[b]				
(1) Teaching	.01	.03	-.02	-.04
(2) Research	-.06	-.02	-.14*	-.15**
(3) Advising	.04	-.09	.02	.04
(4) Working with Student Groups	.00	.01	.08**	.09
(5) Committee Work	.08*	-.11	.16*	.07
(6) Off-Campus Activities	.04	.06	.02	.11
(7) Paper Work	-.10*	-.14**	.06	.05

Table 2 (Continued)

Correlational Coefficients for Various Independent Variables and Intrinsic-Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Male and Female College Professors

Independent Variable	Dimensions of Job Satisfaction			
	Intrinsic		Extrinsic	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
II Faculty Activities and Affiliations				
C. Scholarly Activities[c]				
(1) Publications	-.05	-.09	.03	.06
(2) Submits Papers for Publication	.04	.09	.11*	.05
(3) Presents Papers at Professional Meetings	-.05	-.05	.01	-.06
(4) Publishes Teaching Material	-.02	.02	.01	-.04
(5) Gives Concerts, Art Exhibits, Poetry Readings, Etc.	.05	-.11	.05	-.02
(6) Number of Memberships in Professional Orgns.	.10*	-.06	.16*	.14**
D. Faculty Development Activities[d]				
(1) In-Service Teaching Programs	-.02	-.15**	-.06	-.04
(2) Attended Workshops On Teaching	-.08**	-.16*	-.08**	-.05
(3) Attended Seminars On Teaching in Your Particular Discipline	-.08**	-.13**	-.09*	-.12**
(4) Taken College or University Course(s) Dealing With Teaching	-.03	-.08	-.04	-.05

Table 2 (Continued)

Correlational Coefficients for Various Independent Variables and Intrinsic-Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Male and Female College Professors

Independent Variable	Dimensions of Job Satisfaction			
	Intrinsic		Extrinsic	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
III Faculty Characteristics				
A. Previous Work Experiences				
(1) Armed Services	.03	-.13**	.05	.02
(2) Business	.01	.08	.00	.04
(3) Industry	.05	-.15**	.01	.10
(4) Government	.05	-.10	.05	.00
(5) Social Service	.01	-.06	.01	.01
B. Academic Background				
(1) Degree Level	.01	.10	.05	-.05
(2) Year of Terminal (PhD.) Degree	-.10*	-.05	-.13*	-.00
(3) Prestige of Degree Granting Institution	.01	.04	.03	.08
C. Academic Rank	.20*	.14**	.24*	.23*
D. Age	.16*	.14**	.17*	.17*

* sig. at .01
** sig. at .05

[a]This is a biserial correlation. Institutions with less than 20% women on faculty were coded 1; Those with over 20% were coded 2.

[b]The question pertinent to these items asked the respondent to indicate the percent of his or her work week that was devoted to each of these tasks.

[c]Respondents were asked to indicate their involvement in each of these activities (1 through 5) for the preceding two years.

[d]Respondents were asked if they had ever been involved in these activities.

The findings pertaining to age and job satisfaction appear to be consistent with those reported by other researchers in business and industry (Altimus and Tersine, 1970; Glenn, Taylor and Weaver, 1977; Herzbert et al, 1957) inasmuch as older faculty of both sexes are significantly more satisfied with both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their work than are younger individuals.

Finally, it may be noted that there is a significant association between academic rank and job satisfaction that extends to both sexes for both domains of job satisfaction. It should come as no surprise to find that as rank increases so does job satisfaction

Stepwise Multiple Regression of Items Associated with Male and Female Job Satisfaction

The evidence presented here suggests that although a number of characteristics that affect the job satisfaction of higher education faculty have similar effects on male and female academics there are just as many that effect the two sexes differently. Consequently we must pursue the analysis further in an effort to determine which items have the greatest influence on men and women respectively when we control for the influence of other variables. In order to do this we have performed two sets of step-wise multiple regression analysis, one for each sex for intrinsic and extrinsic domains of job satisfaction. This precedure allows us to evaluate the relative influence of all the independent variables that we have utilized in this study and to determine which of them are the best predictors of male-female faculty attitudes concerning job satisfaction.

The results of the regression analysis shows that in the realm of intrinsic satisfaction male faculty were most likely to be affected by academic rank, teaching in the field of the humanities and fine arts, attendance at seminars dealing with teaching in one's academic field, age, and having taken courses on college teaching, in that order. The cumulative correlational coefficient for these five best predictors of intrinsic satisfaction is .292. All background indicators account for only 14% of the variance in this dimension of male job satisfaction. This indicates that most of the variance of this dependent variable remains unexplained.

A somewhat similar pattern is evident in the extrinsic dimension of male satisfaction. Here the five best predictors are, in order of strength, academic rank, teaching at a State College, amount of committee work, teaching in the area of the humanities and fine arts, and having taken courses on college teaching. Again the multiple correlational coefficient for these five factors is modest (.360). So too is the total amount of explained variance when all items are entered (21%).

The intrinsic satisfaction of women faculty is best predicted by teaching in the field of nursing and health sciences, service in the armed forces, age, amount of paperwork, and degree level. As the statistics in Table 3 show, only a small (27%) amount of the variance in women's intrinsic satisfaction has been explained here.

In the extrinsic dimensions of women faculty's job satisfaction it appears that one item is notable stronger than the rest in its impact. This is the influence of the sexual composition of an institution. Following this, the next four strongest predictors are academic rank,

Table 3

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Five Highest Predictive Indicators of Intrinsic Satisfaction For Men and Women Respectively

I. Intrinsic Satisfaction of Male Faculty

Indicator	Multiple R	R^2	Beta
1. Academic Rank	.202	.04	.191
2. Teaching in the Humanities and Fine Arts	255	.06	.074
3. Attending Seminars on Teaching in Your Own Discipline	.272	.07	-.048
4. Age	.282	.08	.124
5. Taken Courses on Teaching	.292	.09	.088

Multiple R_2 for 42 Indicators = .379
R^2 for 42 Indicators = .144

II. Intrinsic Satisfaction of Female Faculty

Indicator	Multiple R	R^2	Beta
1. Teaching in Nursing and Health Sciences	.187	.04	.433
2. Previous Service in the Armed Forces	.254	.06	-.054
3. Age	.290	.08	.124
4. Amount of Time Spent on Paperwork	.314	.09	-.121
5. Degree Level	.335	.11	-.135

Multiple R_2 for 42 Indicators = .524
R^2 for 42 Indicators = .274

teaching in the humanities and fine arts, teaching in the social and behavioral sciences, and teaching at a community college. The statistics in Table 4 show that while the total variance explained is somewhat higher here than in the previously described dependent variables, much of the variance in the extrinsic job satisfaction of academic women remains to be explained.

In summarizing these statistics it should be noted that while there is some commonality of influences in the intrinsic/extrinsic dimensions in job satisfaction of male and female academics, there are more differences between the two sexes than there are similarities. This suggests that although male and female academics may be somewhat alike in their feelings about satisfaction with work in higher education, it is apparent that each sex is differentially affected by a variety of background variables that impinge on both the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction.

Discussion

It goes without saying that the results of a study conducted at one point in time and in one area of the country cannot be generalized to college and university faculty throughout the United States. And although we have no reason to think that the composition of these respondents differs markedly from faculty elsewhere, the results reported here apply only to them. It also bears emphasizing that the independent variables selected for analysis are at best an incomplete list. Questions concerning tenure, marital status and children were omitted in the survey questionnaire. Consequently, this may be viewed as an important limitation of the study.

Table 4

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Five Highest Predictive Indicators of Extrinsic Satisfaction For Men and Women Respectively

I. Extrinsic Satisfaction of Male Faculty

Indicator	Multiple R	R^2	Beta
1. Academic Rank	.240	.06	.149
2. Employed by a State College	.293	.09	.225
3. Involvement in Committee Work	.319	.10	.112
4. Teaching in the Humanities and Fine Arts	.341	.12	-.175
5. Having Taken Courses on College Teaching	.360	.13	-.107

Multiple R_2 for 42 Indicators = .453
R^2 for 42 Indicators = .205

II. Extrinsic Satisfaction of Female Faculty

Indicator	Multiple R	R^2	Beta
1. Sex Composition of Instn.	.305	.09	.561
2. Academic Rank	.354	.12	.159
3. Teaching in the Humanities and Fine Arts	.393	.15	-.301
4. Teaching in the Social and Behavioral Sciences	.428	.18	-.246
5. Employed by a Community College	.454	.21	.190

Multiple R_2 for 42 Indicators = .564
R^2 for 42 Indicators = .319

In addition, the weak zero order correlations between the independent variables and the two dimensions of job satisfaction indicates that the results of the study should be treated cautiously. The results of the regression analysis demonstrate that the amount of variance in intrinsic-extrinsic job satisfaction which these items explain is at best modest. This means that while some items are better predictors of job satisfaction than others, few of those examined here should be viewed as major predictors of either intrinsic or extrinsic job satisfaction. In spite of these limitations, the results of this study add to the growing literature on faculty job satisfaction and indicate that male-female differences in job satisfaction among college professors is far more complex than is generally recognized.

In general, the findings reported here are consistent with those found in areas outside academia to the extent that they confirm there is little, if any, difference in job satisfaction between the sexes. For those observers of the work situation in higher education who are concerned with such issues as sexual discrimination and employment inequities between the sexes, these findings should cause concern. They should cause concern because they indicate that in spite of their minority status, and in spite of the frequently marked disparities between themselves and male faculty in such matters as rank, tenure and economic benefits, academic women are not significantly less satisfied with their work than men.[3] How do we explain such apparent inconsistencies? One possibility, which needs to be explored in future research, is the expectancy theory offered by Vroom (1964). The expectancy approach to

job satisfaction suggests that individuals who expect to receive little in the way of occupational rewards will in fact be satisfied with little. Thus, if women academics expect fewer rewards for themselves than do their male colleagues then it is reasonable to assume that they will be equally well satisfied with men on both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of work, even though the objective conditions of their work may be quite different. If this should prove to be the case, there could be some very interesting, if not gloomy, implications for the notion of equal opportunity in higher education.

As mentioned earlier, data on the determinants of male-female job satisfaction provides little support for the idea that the sources of job satisfaction are the same for both sexes. Recall that there seem to be as many differences as there are similarities in factors affecting the job satisfaction of the two sexes. Consideration of these differences should argue effectively against characterizing academic women as "the same as the boys." For example, if these findings are indicative of general trends among women faculty, it would appear that previous career experiences have a much greater influence on the job satisfaction of academic women than on men. This suggests that we need to learn a great deal more about how differences in the socialization experiences of men and women affect their attitudes toward work. As just mentioned, there are also indications that differences in sex may affect the kinds of expectations that a person has about work in academia. This might, for example, help explain why men with newly acquired doctoral degrees are more dissatisfied with their work than their female counterparts.

Many of the findings reported in this study should come as no surprise to those familiar with research on faculty attitudes. For example, in suggesting that dissatisfaction with work may be more pronounced among younger faculty, those in the lower academic ranks, and those who teach in the humanities, social and behavioral sciences, this work confirms the observations made by other researchers (cf. Feuille and Blandin, 1976; Ladd and Lipset, 1975; Seidman, Kelley and Edge, 1974). The findings on women in the nursing and health sciences may add new but not astonishing information about those in these fields. Remember that these women are among the most satisfied of all academic groups surveyed here. This seems to suggest that when women exercise control over a professional area and thus have a substantial voice in determining its policies, standards and practices we should expect their morale to be significantly enhanced. At a more general level, this implies that when women exercise real influence over matters pertaining to their work in higher education they should be expected to experience significantly higher levels of job satisfaction. A similar explanation probably applies to the finding that women who work in institutions with proportionately more women on faculty evince higher levels of extrinsic job satisfaction. Specifically, as the proportion of women on faculty bodies increases, many overt and subtle forms of sexual discrimination may decline. Concomitantly in institutions with less pronounced faculty sexual segregation, there may also be greater involvement by women in the various collegial networks where professional decision making takes place and knowledge is exchanged. If these processes do operate, their effects in enhancing the job satisfaction of women faculty may be considerable.

The material and the explanations presented here are at best tentative and permit few definite conclusions regarding the job satisfaction of academic women. Nevertheless the data do seem to suggest the following observation. Women college professors are not markedly different from other working women to the extent that their subjective evaluations of their work are very similar to those of men - even though the objective conditions of their work are different from those of men. But whether this tendency should be interpreted as a stable condition of the attitudes toward work on the part of academic women is a moot point.

Notes

[1]A notable exception to the general lack of interest in women's attitudes regarding job satisfaction is the work of Hollon and Gemmill (1976) in which male and female professors were compared on participation in decision making, job related tension, job involvement and job satisfaction. For additional information on the subject readers should also see the work of Berman (1979) and Pacheco (1981).

[2]For a review of some of the more common variables that have been found to be associated with job satisfaction among workers in business and industry interested readers should see Sauser and York (1978) and Weaver (1978).

[3]For those institutions included in this study the salary differentials between men and women for a nine month appointment were as follows: Community Colleges, $1,500.00; State Colleges, $3,100.00; Universities, $4,400.00; Private Liberal Arts Colleges, $4,800.00. (Data is for 1980).

Appendix A

Items Attributed to the Various Dimensions and Facets of Job Satisfaction

The Extrinsic Dimension

A. The Economic Dimension*
   (1) Salary
   (2) Tenure
   (3) Fringe benefits
   (4) Salary parity with other institutions
   (5) The clarity and consistency of institutional requirements for promotion, tenure, and retention
   (6) Retirement policies
   *Coefficient Alpha is .88

B. The Administrative Dimension*
   (1) Involvement in faculty hiring and termination decisions
   (2) Involvement in campus promotion and tenure decisions
   (3) Involvement in general policy making
   (4) Involvement in extracurricular development
   *Coefficient Alpha is .87

C. The Associational Dimension*
   (1) The opportunity to associate professionally with others in your field
   (2) The opportunity to socialize with professionals
   (3) The interest which other colleagues have in your work
   (4) The co-operation of your colleagues
   *Coefficient Alpha is .84

The Intrinsic Dimension

A. The Teaching Dimension*
   (1) Association with college age students
   (2) Teaching
   (3) Opportunities to influence young people
   (4) The academic growth of young people
   (5) The motivational level of your students
   *Coefficient Alpha is .92

B. The Recognition-Support Dimension*
   (1) Recognition of scholarly achievement
   (2) Support for teaching innovation
   (3) Support for research
   (4) Opportunities for research
   *Coefficient Alpha is .90

C. The Convenience Dimension*
   (1) Physical surroundings of work
   (2) Freedom from conflicting occupational demands
   (3) Amounts of work
   (4) Variety of occupational tasks
   (5) Office facilities
   *Coefficient Alpha is .89

References

Altimus, C.A., and R.J. Tersine. "Chronological Age and Job Satisfaction: The Young Blue-Collar Worker," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 16, (1973), 53-66.

Berman, M.R. "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction and Role Conflict in Men and Women, Full and Part-time Faculty at the University of Maryland, College Park Campus." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1979.

Feuille, P., and J. Blandin. "University Faculty and Attitudinal Militancy Toward the Employment Relationship," Sociology of Education, Vol. 49 (1976), 139-145.

Glenn, N.D., P.A. Taylor and C.N. Weaver. "Age and Job Satisfaction: A Multivariate, Multisurvey Study," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 62 (1977), 189-193.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, R.O. Petersen, and D.F. Capwell. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Hollon, D.J., and G.R. Gemmill. "A Comparison of Female and Male Professors on Participation in Decision Making, Job Related Tension, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 12 (1976), 80-93.

Hulin, C.L., and P.C. Smith. "Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 48 (1964), 88-92.

Kanter, R.M. Men and Women of The Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Ladd, E.C. and S.M. Lipset. The Divided Academy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Moore, K., and P.A. Wollitzer. Women in Higher Education: A Contemporary Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1980.

Pacheco, A. "Sex Role Attitudes, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction Among Women Professors at the University of Puerto Rico." A paper presented a the Fourth Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, 1981.

Quinn, R.P., G.S. Staines, and M.R. McCullough. Job Satisfaction: Is There a Trend? Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, 1974.

Sauser, W.I., and C.M. York. "Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction: A Re-examination," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 31 (1978), 537-547.

Seidman, J., L. Kelley, and A. Edge. "Faculty Bargaining Comes to Hawaii," Industrial Relations, Vol. 13 (1974), 5-22.

Vroom, V.H. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Weaver, C.N. "Sex Differences in the Determinants of Job Satisfaction," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 20 (1978), 265-274.